arXiv:1601.08063v3 [hep-ph] 17 May 2016

Coxeter groups and the PMNS matrix

Pritibhajan Byakti

Center for High Energy Physics

Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore 560012, INDIA

Palash B. Pal

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics

1/AF Bidhan-Nagar, Calcutta 700064, INDIA

Abstract

We discuss the symmetries of the Lagrangian of the leptonic sector. We consider the case when this symmetry group is a Coxeter group. The number of elements of the PMNS matrix predicted by this group structure would depend on the number of generators of this group. We analyze finite Coxeter groups with 2 to 4 generators and even finite subgroups of infinite Coxeter groups with 4 generators and show which of them can give results that are consistent with experimental data.

1 Introduction

Thanks to various experiments involving neutrino oscillations [1–5], the mixing matrix in the leptonic sector is known to a good accuracy [6, 7]. The question then arises as to whether one can understand the mixing matrix from some theoretical considerations [8–10]. The considerations would definitely involve some symmetry. One can look at the experimentally allowed values for the elements of the leptonic mixing matrix, also called the PMNS matrix, and try to guess a symmetry that would fit the values. This approach has resulted, based on experimental data available at different points of time, in various schemes of neutrino mixing such as the bimaximal (BM) [11, 12] or the tribimaximal (TBM) [13, 14]. To explain these patterns, a different approach was considered, in which one writes down the Lagrangian at some high energy scale like the grand unified scale, and then predicts the patterns

by considering the running of various parameters down to low scales. Literature of this approach is vast; see Refs. [8–10] and references therein. There is yet another approach [15–19] in which one starts with identifying symmetries of the mass terms in the physical basis, i.e., the basis in which the mass matrices are diagonal. One assumes that these symmetries are remnants of a bigger symmetry group that is presumably valid at some large energy scale. If one assumes that this bigger group is a finite group, one tries to identify it by starting with the remnant symmetries as generators and building the group by imposing suitable conditions on the generators. The bigger symmetry then dictates the structure of the PMNS matrix: if not the whole matrix, at least some elements of it. Luckily in this approach, one is not required to write down any Lagrangian for high energy scale. Simple group-theoretical calculations give us the PMNS matrix.

We assume that the neutrinos are Majorana particles, in which case the symmetries associated with the neutrino field redefinitions must be involutions, i.e., the square of the symmetry transformations must yield the identity transformation. In the charged lepton sector, the redefinitions can be different. For the sake of simplicity, one assumes a discrete symmetry in this sector as well [15]. At first, people tried to obtain the TBM matrix with this assumption, because the TBM was consistent with experimental data at that time. When the experimental data confirming a non-zero value of θ_{13} poured in [2, 3], the work continued with the same philosophy, but with the changed data. In such attempts [18, 19], it was first assumed that the eigenvalues of the symmetry generators of the charged leptons are non-degenerate. However, degeneracy cannot be ruled out from any physical consideration, and a large number of authors have explored various symmetries, with or without degenerate eigenvalues [20–28]. They have identified several groups that can predict at least some of the elements of the PMNS matrix.

In this work, we want to perform the same kind of search over a class of groups which are called Coxeter groups. While the precise definition of Coxeter groups will be given much later in § 5, at this point it might be enough to know that these are discrete groups which can be generated with elements which are involutions, i.e., elements which are of order 2.

Interestingly, such groups were also arrived at by Lam [29] while searching for "built-in" symmetries in SO(10) grand unified models. Our approach, however, has nothing to do with the gauge group. We perform a systematic analysis over finite and infinite Coxeter groups, pointing out from time to time which other groups already discussed in the literature fall within this category.

When one deals with Coxeter groups, degeneracy in the eigenvalues cannot be avoided since there exist only two distinct eigenvalues for each generator. Therefore, after a general analysis of the symmetries of the mass terms and currents and the presentation of some earlier results in § 2, we show how to tackle degenerate phases in § 3. We summarize the experimental data in § 4 and set up the strategy for the search of Coxeter groups that might be consistent with the data. The analysis is performed in § 5, after presenting an inventory of all known finite Coxeter groups with 4 or less generators. In § 6 we considered finite subgroups of infinite Coxeter groups with four generators. We summarize our findings and our outlook in § 7.

2 Consideration of symmetries

We start by a brief review of the method [18, 19]. If the Lagrangian of the leptonic sector is written in terms of the mass eigenstates, it contains the following terms:

$$\mathscr{L} = \sum_{\ell,\alpha} \left[\frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\bar{\ell} U_{\ell\alpha} \gamma^\mu L \nu_\alpha W_\mu^+ + \text{h.c.} \right) - M_\ell \bar{\ell}\ell - \frac{1}{2} m_\alpha \nu_\alpha^\top C \nu_\alpha \right] , \tag{2.1}$$

where $\ell = e, \mu, \tau$, whereas the neutrino eigenstates are indexed by $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$. Note that here and anywhere else, we use the Einstein summation convention for Lorentz indices, but not for indices used for differentiating different particles. The neutrinos have been assumed to be Majorana particles. There are of course other terms in the Lagrangian that involves the leptons, but they are not crucial for the argument that follows.

The mass terms in Eq. (2.1) admit the following symmetries:

$$\nu_\alpha \longrightarrow \eta_\alpha \nu_\alpha \,, \tag{2.2a}$$

$$\ell \longrightarrow e^{i\varphi_\ell} \ell \,. \tag{2.2b}$$

Because each neutrino eigenstate has to satisfy the Majorana condition,

$$\bar{\nu}_\alpha = \nu^\top C \tag{2.3}$$

for some unitary matrix C, each η_α must be real, i.e.,

$$\eta_\alpha = \pm 1 \qquad \forall \alpha \,. \tag{2.4}$$

The maximum possible symmetry in Eq. (2.2) is therefore $[Z_2]^3$ from the neutrino sector and $[\mathrm{U}(1)]^3$ from the charged leptons. The interaction of leptons with the

Z-boson and the Higgs boson also obey this symmetry, which is why we have not written them down in Eq. (2.1). On the other hand, the charged current interaction term of Eq. (2.1) remains invariant if we augment the transformations of Eq. (2.2) by the rule

$$U_{\ell\alpha} \longrightarrow U_{\ell\alpha} e^{-i\varphi_\ell} \eta_\alpha \,. \tag{2.5}$$

This is then the arbitrariness in the definition of the PMNS matrix U.

Because of this arbitrariness, it would be pointless to try to predict the PMNS matrix U. However, one can try whether one can somehow use the symmetry of Eq. (2.5) to get some information about the absolute values of the matrix elements of U. To this end, we rewrite Eq. (2.2) in the form

$$\boldsymbol{\nu} \longrightarrow S\boldsymbol{\nu} \,, \tag{2.6a}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\ell} \longrightarrow T\boldsymbol{\ell} \,, \tag{2.6b}$$

where the bold letters indicate column matrices in flavor space, whereas S and T are diagonal matrices. Now, in order to make the problem more tractable, one assumes that

$$\det S = \det T = 1 \,, \tag{2.7}$$

so that

$$\eta_1 \eta_2 \eta_3 = 1 \,, \tag{2.8a}$$

$$\phi_e + \phi_\mu + \phi_\tau = 0 \bmod 2\pi. \tag{2.8b}$$

Then the symmetry for the neutrino fields can be generated by the matrices

$$S_1 = \mathrm{diag}(1,-1,-1), \qquad S_2 = \mathrm{diag}(-1,1,-1), \qquad S_3 = \mathrm{diag}(-1,-1,1). \tag{2.9}$$

Since

$$S_1 S_2 S_3 = 1 \,, \tag{2.10}$$

there are only two independent operations, and therefore the symmetry is at most $Z_2 \times Z_2$. On the other hand, the symmetry in the charged lepton sector, already reduced to $[\mathrm{U}(1)]^2$ because of Eq. (2.8b), is further reduced by assuming that T is the representation of a discrete group. The discrete group must then be of the form $Z_n \times Z_{n'}$.

Let us now discuss the whole thing from the flavor basis of neutrinos. The neutrino fields in this basis are given by

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = U\boldsymbol{\nu}\,, \tag{2.11}$$

with the tilde indicating the basis in which the charged lepton mass matrix is diagonal. The neutrino mass matrix in this basis takes the form

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{m}} = U^*\boldsymbol{m}U^\dagger\,. \tag{2.12}$$

The symmetry of Eq. (2.6) now becomes

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \longrightarrow S'\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\,, \qquad \tilde{\boldsymbol{m}} \longrightarrow S'^{\top}\tilde{\boldsymbol{m}}S' \tag{2.13}$$

where

$$S' = USU^\dagger\,, \tag{2.14}$$

S being any of the matrices of Eq. (2.9). There is no reason to assume that S' and T commute. Depending on their structures, we can deduce the moduluses of different elements of the PMNS matrix U.

As the simplest example, we can consider that the flavor groups in neutrino and charged lepton sectors each has one generator only. Since Eq. (2.14) implies that $S'^2 = 1$, it means that the symmetry group will be Z_2 for the neutrino sector and Z_n, for some n, in the charged lepton sector. The Z_2 group of the neutrino sector must be generated by one of the matrices S'_α, defined through Eq. (2.14). One can then introduce the group element

$$W_\alpha = S'_\alpha T\,, \tag{2.15}$$

and assume that this element also has a finite order. The group now will be defined by the relations

$$S'^2_\alpha = T^n = W_i^p = 1\,, \tag{2.16}$$

which defines the von Dyck group $D(2, n, p)$.

In order to obtain the elements of the PMNS matrix, one evaluates

$$a_\alpha \equiv \mathrm{Tr}(W_\alpha) = \sum_\ell (2|U_{\ell\alpha}|^2 - 1)e^{i\phi_\ell}. \tag{2.17}$$

Using real and imaginary part of the above equation with unitary condition for U, one can exactly solve [18,19] the absolute values of one column of the PMNS matrix. The solution is given by

$$|U_{e\alpha}|^2 \;=\; \frac{\mathrm{Re}(a_\alpha)\cos\frac{\phi_e}{2}+\cos\frac{3\phi_e}{2}-\mathrm{Im}(a_\alpha)\sin\frac{\phi_e}{2}}{4\sin\frac{\phi_e-\phi_\mu}{2}\sin\frac{\phi_\tau-\phi_e}{2}}\,, \tag{2.18}$$

with $|U_{\mu\alpha}|^2$ and $|U_{\tau\alpha}|^2$ obtained by making cyclic permutation of the indices e, μ, τ. Similarly, if we have two Z_2 symmetries in the neutrino sector, we can obtain expressions for another column. Hence, by using unitarity conditions, the remaining column can also be determined, which means that we would know the absolute values of all entries of the PMNS matrix.

3 Degenerate phases

Eq. (2.18), and similar ones for the other elements of the same column, cannot be the most general formulas [23]. One can easily see that they break down when any two of the phases φ_e, φ_μ and φ_τ are equal. There can be three possibilities with a two-fold degeneracy:

$$\begin{aligned} T_e &= \mathrm{diag}\left(e^{-2i\phi_e}, e^{i\phi_e}, e^{i\phi_e}\right), \\ T_\mu &= \mathrm{diag}\left(e^{i\phi_\mu}, e^{-2i\phi_\mu}, e^{i\phi_\mu}\right), \\ T_\tau &= \mathrm{diag}\left(e^{i\phi_\tau}, e^{i\phi_\tau}, e^{-2i\phi_\tau}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

In analogy with the quantities defined in Eq. (2.17), we now define the following quantities:

$$a_{\ell\alpha} = \mathrm{Tr}(T_\ell S'_\alpha) = \mathrm{Tr}(T_\ell U S_\alpha U^\dagger)\,. \tag{3.2}$$

The traces are easily determined and one obtains

$$a_{\ell\alpha} = -e^{-2i\phi_\ell} + 2|U_{\ell\alpha}|^2(e^{-2i\phi_\ell} - e^{i\phi_\ell})\,. \tag{3.3}$$

Writing $a_{\ell\alpha} = |a_{\ell\alpha}|e^{i\psi_{\ell\alpha}}$, multiplying both sides of Eq. (3.3) by $e^{-i\psi_{\ell\alpha}}$ and considering the real and imaginary parts of the resulting equation, we find

$$|U_{\ell\alpha}|^2 \;=\; \frac{\sin(2\phi_\ell+\psi_{\ell\alpha})}{4\sin(\frac{3}{2}\phi_\ell)\cos(\psi_{\ell\alpha}+\frac{1}{2}\phi_\ell)} \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$|a_{\ell\alpha}| = -\frac{\cos(\frac{3}{2}\phi_\ell)}{\cos(\psi_{\ell\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}\phi_\ell)}\,. \tag{3.5}$$

In general, the order of any generator of a discrete group can be 2 or any higher integer. The S' generators must be of order 2. When HS [18, 19] considered von Dyck groups, they implicitly assumed that the order of the T generator is greater than 2. We explore exactly the case left out in this procedure, i.e., consider the case when all symmetry generators are involutions, and therefore the group is a Coxeter group. We will not restrict our analysis to groups with two generators. In fact, the emphasis will remain on finding groups with four generators so that all elements of the PMNS matrix can be determined.

For generators of order 2, $\phi_\ell = \pi$. This fact has several important consequences. First, we see from Eq. (3.1) that now the generators T_ℓ are of the form

$$T_e = \mathrm{diag}(1,-1,-1), \qquad T_\mu = \mathrm{diag}(-1,1,-1), \qquad T_\tau = \mathrm{diag}(-1,-1,1)\,, \tag{3.6}$$

so that

$$T_e T_\mu T_\tau = 1\,, \tag{3.7}$$

implying that only two of these generators are independent. Second, we see that in Eq. (3.5), the numerator on the right side vanishes, so that we can obtain a non-zero value of $|a_{\ell\alpha}|$ only if the denominator vanishes as well, which implies that $\sin\psi_{\ell\alpha} = 0$, i.e., $a_{\ell\alpha}$ is real. We can now use Eq. (3.3) to write

$$|U_{\ell\alpha}|^2 = \frac{1}{4}\Big(1 + a_{\ell\alpha}\Big)\,. \tag{3.8}$$

Suppose now that the order of the element

$$W_{\ell\alpha} = T_\ell S'_\alpha \tag{3.9}$$

is $p_{\ell\alpha}$. The quantity $a_{\ell\alpha}$, being the trace of $W_{\ell\alpha}$, is therefore nothing but the sum of three $p_{\ell\alpha}^{\rm th}$ root of unity. Since the sum is real, either all the considered roots are real, or one is real and remaining two are complex conjugates of each other. In either case, there is at least one real root A, and we can separate it out to write

$$\begin{aligned} a_{\ell\alpha} &= A + \left(\exp\left(2\pi i\frac{k_{\ell\alpha}}{p_{\ell\alpha}}\right) + \exp\left(-2\pi i\frac{k_{\ell\alpha}}{p_{\ell\alpha}}\right)\right), \\ &= A + 2\cos\left(2\pi\frac{k_{\ell\alpha}}{p_{\ell\alpha}}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Further, because the determinant of $W_{\ell\alpha}$ must be equal to 1 because of Eq. (2.7), we must have

$$A = 1\,. \tag{3.11}$$

We can then use Eqs. (3.8) and (3.10) to obtain

$$|U_{\ell\alpha}|^2 = \frac{1}{2}\left[1 + \cos\left(2\pi\frac{k_{\ell\alpha}}{p_{\ell\alpha}}\right)\right] = \cos^2\left(\pi\frac{k_{\ell\alpha}}{p_{\ell\alpha}}\right). \tag{3.12}$$

The task is now to find different combinations of $p_{\ell\alpha}$ and $k_{\ell\alpha}$ that will produce values of $|U_{\ell\alpha}|^2$ that fall within the experimentally allowed ranges. Before embarking on this journey, we should summarize the experimental results that we are trying to fit.

4 Confronting experimental results

The PMNS matrix is written in terms of three angles and three CP-violating phases [30]:

$$\begin{aligned} U \;=\; & \begin{pmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ -s_{12}c_{23} - c_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & c_{12}c_{23} - s_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & s_{23}c_{13} \\ s_{12}s_{23} - c_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & -c_{12}s_{23} - s_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & c_{23}c_{13} \end{pmatrix} \\ & \times \mathrm{diag}(1, e^{i\beta_2}, e^{i\beta_3})\,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where, for example, $c_{12} = \cos\theta_{12}$ and $s_{12} = \sin\theta_{12}$. There is no limit on the phases β_2 and β_3. The 3σ limits on the other parameters are as follows [6, 7]:

Parameter	3σ limits for			
	Normal hierarchy		Inverted hierarchy	
	Lower limit	Upper limit	Lower limit	Upper limit
$\sin^2\theta_{12}$	0.259	0.359	0.259	0.359
$\sin^2\theta_{23}$	0.374	0.628	0.380	0.641
$\sin^2\theta_{13}$	0.0176	0.0295	0.0178	0.0298
δ/π	0.86	2.16	0.70	2.02

(4.2)

Using these limits, we find 3σ limits on the absolute values of the elements of the PMNS matrix. For normal hierarchy (NH), the limits are as follows,

$$|U^2| = \begin{pmatrix} 0.622 \text{ to } 0.728 & 0.251 \text{ to } 0.353 & 0.0176 \text{ to } 0.0295 \\ 0.0373 \text{ to } 0.311 & 0.165 \text{ to } 0.539 & 0.363 \text{ to } 0.617 \\ 0.0384 \text{ to } 0.312 & 0.167 \text{ to } 0.541 & 0.361 \text{ to } 0.615 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.3a}$$

whereas for the inverted hierarchy (IH), the limits are slightly different:

$$|U^2| = \begin{pmatrix} 0.622 \text{ to } 0.728 & 0.251 \text{ to } 0.353 & 0.0178 \text{ to } 0.0298 \\ 0.0346 \text{ to } 0.310 & 0.158 \text{ to } 0.536 & 0.369 \text{ to } 0.630 \\ 0.0386 \text{ to } 0.316 & 0.170 \text{ to } 0.550 & 0.348 \text{ to } 0.609 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{4.3b}$$

It should be noted that the ranges indicated here do *not* pertain to values of the matrix elements of U^2. Rather, each entry denotes the range of the range of modulus squared of an element of the PMNS matrix U. These are the ranges that we will use for checking the feasibility of getting a particular Coxeter group.

In this connection, it would be interesting to recall that the structure of the absolute squares of the mixing matrix elements of the BM [11,12] and TBM [13,14] types are as follows:

$$|U^2|_{\rm BM} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix} , \tag{4.4a}$$

$$|U^2|_{\rm TBM} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix} . \tag{4.4b}$$

Of course, neither of these two is consistent with data after the discovery of a non-zero value of the element U_{e3}. However, it should be noted that the TBM matrix fails only in this one element in so far as the 3σ limits of Eq. (4.3) are concerned. On the other hand, the BM matrix fails to satisfy all elements of the first row, although it is consistent with the six elements in the other two rows.

In the approach that we are going to take, we cannot find the magnitudes of all elements of the matrix elements in general. We will discuss, depending on a particular choice of the group, how many elements of the PMNS matrix can be predicted, and will check how they fare in the light of experimental data.

In this pursuit, we will use Eq. (3.12). In order to avoid double counting and unnecessary work, it is useful to keep the following guidelines in mind.

1. The solution $k_{\ell\alpha} = 0$ is not allowed for any $p_{\ell\alpha}$, because it gives $|U_{\ell\alpha}|^2 = 1$ which is not allowed for any element of the PMNS matrix.

2. If $p_{\ell\alpha}$ is even, the value $k_{\ell\alpha} = \frac{1}{2}p_{\ell\alpha}$ is not allowed as well, because it gives $|U_{\ell\alpha}| = 0$, which is unacceptable for any element of the PMNS matrix.

3. Values of $k_{\ell\alpha}$ with

$$k_{\ell\alpha} > \frac{1}{2} p_{\ell\alpha} \tag{4.5}$$

do not produce any new value of $|U_{\ell\alpha}|^2$ that is not already encountered with smaller values of $k_{\ell\alpha}$. Hence, these are irrelevant for our search.

4. Since only the ratio of $k_{\ell\alpha}$ and $p_{\ell\alpha}$ appears in Eq. (3.12), any common factor in the two numbers is irrelevant.

Combining these guidelines, we see that we only need to check for the values

$$0 < k_{\ell\alpha} < \frac{1}{2} p_{\ell\alpha}\,, \tag{4.6}$$

with

$$\gcd(k_{\ell\alpha}, p_{\ell\alpha}) = 1\,. \tag{4.7}$$

For $p_{\ell\alpha} \leq 5$, we present the result of these checks.

$p_{\ell\alpha}$	$k_{\ell\alpha}$	$\lvert U_{\ell\alpha}\rvert^2$	$\ell\alpha$ combinations that give $\lvert U_{\ell\alpha}\rvert^2$ in range
2	1	0	none
3	1	$\frac{1}{4}$	$e2\,\clubsuit, \mu1, \mu2, \tau1, \tau2$
4	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\mu2, \mu3, \tau2, \tau3$
5	1	$\frac{1}{8}(3+\sqrt{5})$	$e1$
5	2	$\frac{1}{8}(3-\sqrt{5})$	$\mu1, \tau1$

(4.8)

Fortunately, the availability of the solutions is not sensitive to the small differences of the allowed values that appear in Eq. (4.3a) and in Eq. (4.3b), so our subsequent analysis apply equally well for both hierarchies. Note that for $k/p = \frac{1}{3}$, we have put a special mark against the possibility of having the $e2$ element. Strictly speaking, this element is ruled out by Eq. (4.3). However, the 3σ range is so very close to the value $\frac{1}{4}$ that we will allow this element as well in our analysis, but will put the same mark against the solutions obtained which utilizes this option.

If the number of generators of the group is more than 2, there is a different kind of relation that we will need to satisfy. To understand the point, let us assume that we have a Coxeter group with two S'-type and one T-type generators. There will be two different combinations $W_{\ell\alpha}$, and therefore two elements of the same column will

be determined through Eq. (3.12). However, it is important to notice that, using Eqs. (2.10) and (2.14), and the unitarity of the PMNS matrix U, we can write

$$S'_1 S'_2 S'_3 = 1\,, \tag{4.9}$$

which means that even the third S'-type matrix is also an element of the group. Instead of taking S'_1 and S'_2, say, as the generators, we could have also chosen S'_1 and S'_3, along with the T-type generator. If we had done that, the modulus of the third element of the column of the PMNS matrix would also have been determined by a relation of the form given in Eq. (3.12). The unitarity condition on the three elements of the same column would have then ensured that

$$\sum_{\alpha=1,2,3} \cos^2\left(\pi \frac{k_{\ell\alpha}}{p_{\ell\alpha}}\right) = 1\,. \tag{4.10}$$

Similarly, if we had considered a Coxeter group with two T-type and one S'-type generators, we would have obtained

$$\sum_{\ell=e,\mu,\tau} \cos^2\left(\pi \frac{k_{\ell\alpha}}{p_{\ell\alpha}}\right) = 1\,. \tag{4.11}$$

Both kinds of equations can be written in the form

$$\cos^2\left(\frac{\pi n_1}{N}\right) + \cos^2\left(\frac{\pi n_2}{N}\right) + \cos^2\left(\frac{\pi n_3}{N}\right) = 1\,, \tag{4.12}$$

with a suitably defined N which can be the LCM of the numbers $p_{\ell\alpha}$. If we consider a group with four generators, both Eqs. (4.10) and (4.11) will apply, and therefore there will be six equations of the form given in Eq. (4.12) that need to be satisfied, one for each row and for each column.

There are trivial solutions to Eq. (4.12) in which at least one of the cosines is zero. For example, if N is even, we have solutions in which one of the n_i's is equal to zero and the other two equal to $N/2$, i.e., one of the cosine-squared values is equal to 1 and the other zero. Or we can have solutions like

$$n_1 + n_2 = \frac{1}{2}N\,, \qquad n_3 = \frac{1}{2}N\,, \tag{4.13}$$

along with permutations of the set of numbers n_1, n_2 and n_3. Such solutions will not be useful for us, because they would imply zeroes as elements of the PMNS matrix, which are untenable by experimental results. We need to find solutions of Eq. (4.12) where each of the cosines is non-zero. For this, we used the computer and searched for solutions for $3 \leq N \leq 2500$, and found only the following solutions for the set

of three integers that appear in the numerators of the arguments of cosines in Eq. (4.12), subject to the guidelines summarized in Eqs. (4.6) and (4.7):

N	$\{n_1, n_2, n_3\}$	Values of $\lvert U_{\ell\alpha}\rvert^2$
12	$\{3, 4, 4\}$	$\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\}$
15	$\{3, 5, 6\}$	$\{\frac{1}{8}(3+\sqrt{5}), \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{8}(3-\sqrt{5})\}$

(4.14)

For each choice of N, we have also given, in the last column, the mod-squared values of the entries of the PMNS matrix in the row or column for which that value of N applies. It can be analytically proved [24, 25] that no new solution is obtained even if one looks at arbitrarily larger values of N.

One interesting point to note is that Coxeter groups can never give TBM kind of PMNS matrix. The reason is that the Eq. (3.12) shows that the absolute-squared values of each element must be of the form of the cosine-squared of an angle which is a rational multiple of π, and the TBM form contains absolute-squared values equal to $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{1}{6}$ etc which are not.

5 Finite Coxeter groups

5.1 Coxeter diagrams

We have said earlier that Coxeter groups can be generated by elements of order 2. The complete definition of a Coxeter group includes one more condition: the entire group can be specified once one knows the order of binary products of the generators. !!! The generic presentation of Coxeter groups is therefore of the form

$$\langle r_i | (r_i r_j)^{q_{ij}} \rangle \ , \tag{5.1}$$

where i and j run from 1 up to the number of generators. Because the order of each generator is 2, we have the further constraint that

$$q_{ii} = 1 \qquad \forall i. \tag{5.2}$$

(Once again recall that we are nowhere using implied summation on repeated indices.) It can also be proved easily that

$$q_{ij} = q_{ji} \, . \tag{5.3}$$

In order to specify a particular Coxeter group, one therefore needs the following pieces of information:



Figure 1: Classification of finite Coxeter groups through Coxeter diagrams. We have not included the diagrams of E_6, E_7 and E_8, all of which have more than four generators and are therefore irrelevant for us. Our nomenclature of the groups follows Ref. [31]. In each case, the subscript denotes the number of generators in the presentation of the group.

1. The number of generators.
2. The orders of binary products of the form $r_i r_j$ with $i < j$.

If no power of the product of a particular pair of generators is equal to the identity element, the corresponding q_{ij} is taken to be infinity.

Coxeter diagrams constitute a pictorial way for depicting Coxeter groups. In a Coxeter diagram, each generator is depicted by a blob. If $q_{ij} = 3$ for some particular value of i and j, then the i^{th} and j^{th} blobs are joined by a line. If $q_{ij} > 3$, there is still a line, but the value of q_{ij} is written on the line. If $q_{ij} = 2$, there is no line joining the dots. For example, the diagram ●—●—● would imply that the presentation of the Coxeter group is

$$\left\langle r_1, r_2, r_3 \middle| r_1^2, r_2^2, r_3^2, (r_1 r_2)^3, (r_2 r_3)^3, (r_1 r_3)^2 \right\rangle \,, \tag{5.4}$$

where on the left we give a list of the generators and on the right we give the combinations which are equal to the identity element.

In the present context, we will consider only Coxeter groups with 2 or 3 or 4 generators because, according to the restrictions put forth in Eq. (2.8), we can have at most two generators of the S type and two of the T type. Apart from a few exceptional groups, all finite Coxeter groups fall into one or another of four infinite series, called A_N, B_N, D_N and $I_2(p)$ where the subscripts denote the number of generators. In Fig. 1, we have shown the Coxeter diagrams for all four series, and all

exceptional groups whose number of generators is less than or equal to 4. Although the notations for the diagrams is more or less universal, the names of the groups are not. There are several conventions, and we have followed the one of Ref. [31].

As a passing comment, note that the Coxeter groups A_N are really permutation groups. Any permutation involving n objects can be generated by combining permutations which are transpositions of two adjacent elements. Thus, the group S_n can be generated by transpositions like $\tau_{1,2}$, $\tau_{2,3}$ and so on, up to $\tau_{n-1,n}$. It is also easy to see that products of any two transposition will have order 2 if there are no common objects, and order 3 if there is one common object. Comparing with the diagram of the A_N groups, we therefore see that

$$S_n = A_{n-1}\,. \tag{5.5}$$

From Fig. 1, we see that the only finite Coxeter groups whose number of generators is between 2 and 4 are the following:

$$A_2, A_3, A_4; \tag{5.6a}$$
$$B_2, B_3, B_4; \tag{5.6b}$$
$$D_2, D_3, D_4; \tag{5.6c}$$
$$I_2(p) \qquad \text{with } p = 3, 4, \cdots; \tag{5.6d}$$
$$F_4, H_3, H_4\,. \tag{5.6e}$$

Some groups appear more than once in this list. For example, a look at Fig. 1 suggests the following equivalences:

$$I_2(3) = D_2 = A_2\,, \tag{5.7a}$$
$$D_3 = A_3\,, \tag{5.7b}$$
$$I_2(4) = B_2\,. \tag{5.7c}$$

We will keep these coincidences in mind while identifying distinct groups and discuss whether they give experimentally acceptable result for the elements of the PMNS matrix. In doing so, a few general points should be kept in mind, which we summarize here.

Given any Coxeter diagram, we have to discuss the possibility of assigning each of its dots to a generator of the type S'_α or of the form T_ℓ. For this, we need to remember an important result that can be proved easily: if $q_{ij} = 2$ in Eq. (5.1) for some specific values of i and j, then r_i and r_j commute. Now, note that the S'_α's

commute with one another. Thus, if we assign the generator S'_1 to one of the dots of a Coxeter diagram, any other dot connected to it cannot be assigned to another S' generator: it will have to be a T generator. For the same reason, two connected dots cannot be assigned to two T generators.

5.2 Requirement on irreducible representations

When we sort through the groups, we have to remember that we have three generations of leptons. The charged leptons and the neutrinos must all belong to the same irreducible representation (irrep) of the flavor group. Otherwise, the PMNS matrix would be block-diagonal, whereas experimental data, summarized in Eq. (4.3), confirms that each element of the mixing matrix is non-zero.

This implies that the representation of the T and S'-type generators must be irreducible, as we now show. We have taken a basis in which the T generators are diagonal, so we only need to show that the S' generators must turn out to be block diagonal in this basis if the PMNS matrix is block diagonal. This result follows from the definition of Eq. (2.14). The matrix elements of S'_α obtained from this equation are given by

$$\left(S'_\alpha\right)_{\ell\ell'} = 2U_{\ell\alpha}U^*_{\ell'\alpha} - \delta_{\ell\ell'}\,. \tag{5.8}$$

In particular, any off-diagonal element of S'_α contains just a product of one element of U and the complex conjugate of another element. We know that none of the elements of U is zero, so such products cannot be zero. In other words, the off-diagonal elements of S'_α are all non-zero, and therefore S'_α cannot be block-diagonal. We have therefore proved that if U is not block-diagonal, then S'_α is not block-diagonal. Using the argument of the contrapositive, we can therefore say that if S'_α is block-diagonal, it will make the matrix U block-diagonal.

Thus, if we encounter a group that has only 1 and 2 dimensional irreps, it is useless for us. A group that admits a 3 dimensional irrep is certainly fine. If a group does not have 3 dimensional irrep but has higher dimensional irreps, it also cannot be ruled out. The reason is the following. We are going to follow the Coxeter diagrams, which imply the number of generators and some relations between them, as exemplified in Eq. (5.4). Thus, the groups that we will find will be the ones which are consistent with some conditions on the generators. Suppose a given set of conditions on a fixed number of generators specifies a group G if we assume that there are no other condition connecting the generators. If we impose an extra

condition, we will still obtain a group H which will be a subgroup of G. Even if G does not have a 3-dimensional irrep, it is possible that H does, and maybe this subgroup is responsible for the structure of the PMNS matrix. Thus, a flavor group can be acceptable provided it has irreps of dimension 3 or more.

It is to be understood that this constraint has nothing to do with the use of the Coxeter groups. Eq. (5.8) holds irrespective of the underlying group structure: it just says that, in a basis in which the T-generators are diagonal, the matrix U diagonalizes the matrices S'_α. Thus, this constraint has to be obeyed in any model of this form, irrespective of the T and S'-type generators.

5.3 Groups with two generators

From the discussion at the end of § 5.1, it is clear that if we look for a group with two generators, one of these generators must be S'_α for some value of α, and the other would be T_ℓ for some ℓ. Therefore, we will be able to determine only one element of the PMNS matrix, viz., the element $U_{\ell\alpha}$.

The number of elements predicted might be disappointingly low, but there is no reason to be unhappy about it, because we now argue that none of these groups is viable. Looking at Eq. (5.7), we see that we need to consider only $I_2(p)$ groups, because all other groups with two generators is isomorphic to either $I_2(3)$ or $I_2(4)$. However, these $I_2(p)$ groups are dihedral groups, i.e., symmetry groups of regular polygons. It is known that they have only 1 or 2 dimensional representations. Thus, they are unacceptable for us.

5.4 Groups with three generators

With three generators, Fig. 1 shows us that we have the groups A_3, B_3 and H_3. The diagrams of these three groups look the same: three dots joined by two links. They differ only in the order of one link. Recalling that we cannot assign two S' generators or two T generators to the ends of any link, we must alternate the two types of generators. Thus, we will either get the generators to be of $S'TS'$ type, with whatever indices, or of the type $TS'T$. In the first case, we will be able to determine the absolute values of two elements belonging to the same column of the PMNS matrix, whereas in the second case we will be able to do the same for two elements belonging to the same row. In either case, we will be able to tell the remaining element of the same column or row, as the case may be, by using a suitable unitarity relation. According to the discussion of § 4, this extra value thus

Table 1: Allowed generators for the group A_3. The ♣ marks on the list of generators of some groups indicate that the solution involves $|U_{e2}|^2 = \frac{1}{4}$, about which we commented after Eq. (4.8).

Generators	Determination from		Which solution
	Eq. (3.12)	Unitarity	of Eq. (4.14)
$\{S'_1, T_\mu, S'_2\}$ $\{S'_2, T_\mu, S'_1\}$	$\lvert U_{\mu 1}\rvert^2 = \lvert U_{\mu 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$\lvert U_{\mu 3}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{2}$	$N = 12$
$\{S'_1, T_\tau, S'_2\}$ $\{S'_1, T_\tau, S'_2\}$	$\lvert U_{\tau 1}\rvert^2 = \lvert U_{\tau 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$\lvert U_{\tau 3}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{2}$	$N = 12$
$\{T_e, S'_2, T_\mu\}$♣ $\{T_\mu, S'_2, T_e\}$♣	$\lvert U_{e2}\rvert^2 = \lvert U_{\mu 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$\lvert U_{\tau 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{2}$	$N = 12$
$\{T_e, S'_2, T_\tau\}$♣ $\{T_\tau, S'_2, T_e\}$♣	$\lvert U_{e2}\rvert^2 = \lvert U_{\tau 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$\lvert U_{\mu 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{2}$	$N = 12$

obtained must also be of the form given in Eq. (3.12), i.e., should be a solution of an equation of the form Eq. (4.10) or Eq. (4.11).

Because we obtain a full row or a full column, it is not necessary to check whether the group has any 3-dimensional irrep. If the only irreps are 1 and 2-dimensional, each row and each column must have at least one element equal to zero. Thus, if we just determine one row or one column and do not find a zero in it, it guarantees that the representation is not reducible. On the other hand, if we obtain at least one zero, it does not guarantee that the representation is reducible, but it does say that the group should be discarded because none of the entries in Eq. (4.3) is consistent with zero.

The group A_3: In this case, both links have order 3. Looking at Eq. (4.8), we see that the choice of k is unique. For each possible choice of the generators, we give the list of matrix element whose absolute values are determined through Eq. (3.8), and both these values should be $\frac{1}{4}$ as shown in Eq. (4.8). Unitarity of the mixing matrix would dictate that the absolute square of the remaining element of the same row or same column should be equal to $\frac{1}{2}$, as discussed above. We look for all combinations of generators and list the acceptable ones in Table 1.

This group is isomorphic to the permutation group S_4, as pointed out in Eq.

Table 2: Allowed generators for the group B_3. For the ♣ marks by some choices of generators, see caption of Table 1.

Generators	Determination from		Which solution
	Eq. (3.12)	Unitarity	of Eq. (4.14)
$\{T_\mu, S'_2, T_\tau\}$♣	$\lvert U_{\mu 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{2}, \lvert U_{\tau 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$\lvert U_{e2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$N = 12$
$\{T_\tau, S'_2, T_\mu\}$♣	$\lvert U_{\tau 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{2}, \lvert U_{\mu 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$\lvert U_{e2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$N = 12$
$\{S'_3, T_\mu, S'_1\}$	$\lvert U_{\mu 3}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{2}, \lvert U_{\mu 1}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$\lvert U_{\mu 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$N = 12$
$\{S'_3, T_\mu, S'_2\}$	$\lvert U_{\mu 3}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{2}, \lvert U_{\mu 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$\lvert U_{\mu 1}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$N = 12$
$\{S'_3, T_\tau, S'_1\}$	$\lvert U_{\tau 3}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{2}, \lvert U_{\tau 1}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$\lvert U_{\tau 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$N = 12$
$\{S'_3, T_\tau, S'_2\}$	$\lvert U_{\tau 3}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{2}, \lvert U_{\tau 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$\lvert U_{\tau 1}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$N = 12$
$\{T_\mu, S'_2, T_e\}$♣	$\lvert U_{\mu 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{2}, \lvert U_{e 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$\lvert U_{\tau 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$N = 12$
$\{T_\tau, S'_2, T_e\}$♣	$\lvert U_{\tau 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{2}, \lvert U_{e 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$\lvert U_{\mu 2}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$N = 12$

(5.5), and has been encountered by various authors [32–34] in models inspired by grand unified theories.

The group B_3: Here, one link has order 4 and one has order 3. As in Fig. 1, we take the left link to have order 4. Because of this link of order 4, this time we will have to distinguish which generator corresponds to the right dot and which one to the left, something that was not important for the previous case. We list all allowed possibilities in Table 2.

This group appeared in the discussion of Ref. [35], but only as a factor in a semi-direct product.

The group H_3: As in Fig. 1, we take the left link to have order 5. The right link then has order 3. The modulus squared value of the matrix element corresponding to the right link is $\frac{1}{4}$, according to Eq. (4.8). The value coming from the left link can be either $\frac{1}{8}(3+\sqrt{5}) = 0.6545$ or $\frac{1}{8}(3-\sqrt{5}) = 0.0955$, depending on the value of $k_{\ell\alpha}$. In either case, the modulus squared values of the three elements in one row or one column should be $\frac{1}{8}(3+\sqrt{5})$, $\frac{1}{8}(3-\sqrt{5})$ and $\frac{1}{4}$, in whatever order. There is only one element in Eq. (4.3) that can be as big as 0.6545, and that is $|U_{e1}|^2$. In the same row, there is no element that can take a value 0.0955, so we obtain no acceptable

Table 3: Allowed generators for the group H_3.

Generators	Determination from		Which solution
	Eq. (3.12)	Unitarity	of Eq. (4.14)
$\{T_e, S'_1, T_\mu\}$	$\lvert U_{e1}\rvert^2 = 0.6545, \lvert U_{\mu 1}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$\lvert U_{\tau 1}\rvert^2 = 0.0955$	$N = 15$
$\{T_e, S'_1, T_\tau\}$	$\lvert U_{e1}\rvert^2 = 0.6545, \lvert U_{\tau 1}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$\lvert U_{\mu 1}\rvert^2 = 0.0955$	$N = 15$
$\{T_\mu, S'_1, T_\tau\}$	$\lvert U_{\mu 1}\rvert^2 = 0.0955, \lvert U_{\tau 1}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$\lvert U_{e1}\rvert^2 = 0.6545$	$N = 15$
$\{T_\tau, S'_1, T_\mu\}$	$\lvert U_{\tau 1}\rvert^2 = 0.0955, \lvert U_{\mu 1}\rvert^2 = \frac{1}{4}$	$\lvert U_{e1}\rvert^2 = 0.6545$	$N = 15$

solution. The first column, however, is acceptable, and we show the groups which can give rise to those values in Table 3.

5.5 Groups with four generators

From Fig. 1, we see that the finite groups with four generators are A_4, B_4, D_4, F_4 and H_4. Let us give the final result first: none of these groups is allowed. We explain the reasons in what follows.

Let us discuss D_4 first. Its Coxeter diagram has one nodal blob, from which three links come out to meet the three other blobs. If we assign an S' generator to the nodal blob, we must assign T-type generators to all other blobs. However, there are only two T-type independent generators, so this group is untenable. Even if we venture to put three different T-type generators on the three blobs, unitarity condition is not fulfilled since we get $|U_{\ell\alpha}|^2 = \frac{1}{4}$ for all elements in a column. The argument with a T-type generator as the middle blob is the same, and need not be repeated.

For all other groups the list, the Coxeter diagrams are linear. Because the S'-type and T-type generators alternate on a line, one of the two extreme blobs must correspond to an S'-type generator and the other one to a T-type generator. There is no line joining these two blobs, which means that there is a $W_{\ell\alpha}$ which is of order 2. But $p_{\ell\alpha} = 2$ does not give any acceptable solution, as noted in Eq. (3.12).

Let us now ignore the constraint that all the calculated PMNS elements must comply with the experimentally observed values within a 3σ limit and examine whether any of these groups can even satisfy the unitarity conditions. There is at least one pair of T and S' generators which are not connected by a link, i.e.,

the corresponding $W_{\ell\alpha}$ has $p_{\ell\alpha} = 2$. Therefore, one entry of the calculated PMNS matrix must be zero or unity, depending on the value of $k_{\ell\alpha}$. If $k_{\ell\alpha} = 0$ and therefore $|U_{\ell\alpha}|^2 = 1$ for one element, the other two in the same row and in the same column must be zero, and so there will be one eigenstate that will not mix with the other two. On the contrary, if $k_{\ell\alpha} = 1$, that particular element vanishes, and so the sum of absolute squared values of two other elements of the PMNS matrix in the same row where zero entry is there must be unity. This is true also for the column containing this zero entry.

For the A_4 group, $p_{\ell\alpha} = 3$ for all the links and $|U_{\ell\alpha}|^2 = \frac{1}{4}$. Thus two such entries cannot add up to 1, and one cannot produce a unitary matrix. The group H_4 has $p_{\ell\alpha} = 3, 5$. There are no two allowed values of $|U_{\ell\alpha}|^2$, corresponding to these values of $p_{\ell\alpha}$, which add up to 1, and hence the fate of this group is the same. For the groups B_4 and F_4, one link has values of $p_{\ell\alpha} = 4$, which can give $|U_{\ell\alpha}|^2 = \frac{1}{2}$, but then the other two have $p_{\ell\alpha} = 3$, which can produce a maximum of $\frac{1}{4}$. Thus we'll get at most $\frac{3}{4}$ as the required sum. So we see that none of the 4-generator groups can even produce a unitary PMNS matrix, let alone agree with experimental data.

6 Beyond finite groups

We see that, among the finite Coxeter groups, the only acceptable solutions have three generators, which give only one column or one row of the PMNS matrix. Since we could not find any group with four generators, we cannot determine the entire PMNS matrix. Because of this, we now look for infinite Coxeter groups, hoping that the infinite group might have a finite subgroup that will determine the elements of the PMNS matrix. In order to completely obtain the PMNS matrix, we need groups with 4 or more generators, and we analyze only groups with the number of generators equal to 4.

We note that unitarity conditions like that in Eq. (4.12) do not depend on whether the Coxeter group is finite or infinite. To be precise, they depend only on the fact that the generators of the group are involutions. For example, if we have generators which are involutions, but have more conditions in the presentation of the group than what is prescribed in the definition of Coxeter groups in Eq. (5.1), then we will obtain a subgroup of a Coxeter group. But such a group will also satisfy the conditions given in Eq. (4.12). According to the discussion of § 4, we have only a few choices for the values of $|U_{\ell\alpha}|^2$ subject to the unitarity conditions.

We discuss these choices now, outlining a much more lenient search scheme among infinite Coxeter groups.

1. One kind of solutions of Eq. (4.12), obtainable for even N, gives two zeroes on one row or one column. These solutions yield, modulo possible reshuffling of rows or columns, a block-diagonal or even a completely diagonal PMNS matrix, and we disregard them.

2. Suppose now we use the trivial solution of Eq. (4.13) for one row of the PMNS matrix. This will already have one zero in the row. For the sake of convenience in describing the situation, let us assume that this zero occurs in the first row and the third column. Then the other two elements of the row must sum up to 1. Suppose also that we decide to tolerate only up to one zero entry, so that no other row, and none of the columns, corresponds to this trivial solution. Moreover, the first two columns must come from the solutions shown in Eq. (4.14), and we see that the only way the mod-squared of two elements from these two columns sum up to 1 is by having both mod-squared values equal to $\frac{1}{2}$. Thus, the first row has the elements $\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0\}$. The same argument applies for the third column. Now the first and second columns must correspond to the $N = 12$ solution of Eq. (4.14), and the last two rows must also have the same property. Overall then, we obtain the BM solution given in Eq. (4.4a).

3. The solution with $N = 12$ presented in Eq. (4.14) can be used for each row and each column, producing the mod-squared values of the elements of a unitary matrix:

$$|U^2|_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} \\ \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{4} \\ \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix} \tag{6.1a}$$

   Of course it will have to be understood that variations can be obtained by reshuffling the rows or columns.

4. One can also use the solution with $N = 15$ from Eq. (4.14) to construct the following values of the mod-squared values of the elements:

$$|U^2|_{15} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{8}(3+\sqrt{5}) & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{8}(3-\sqrt{5}) \\ \frac{1}{8}(3-\sqrt{5}) & \frac{1}{8}(3+\sqrt{5}) & \frac{1}{4} \\ \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{8}(3-\sqrt{5}) & \frac{1}{8}(3+\sqrt{5}) \end{pmatrix} \tag{6.1b}$$

   As before, reshuffling of rows or columns is allowed.

5. There can also be solutions where some rows will come from the $N = 12$ solution and some from the $N = 15$ solution. Of course, the latter kind must come in pairs because the occurrence of the irrational value of either $\cos^2(\pi/5)$ or $\cos^2(2\pi/5)$ cannot be consistent with the unitarity condition without the occurrence of the other. Thus, the solution is

$$|U^2|_{12\&15} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{8}(3+\sqrt{5}) & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{8}(3-\sqrt{5}) \\ \frac{1}{8}(3-\sqrt{5}) & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{8}(3+\sqrt{5}) \\ \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{4} \end{pmatrix} . \tag{6.1c}$$

Here also, reshuffling of rows or columns produces acceptable alternatives.

Now here is our more lenient search strategy. We will not pay attention to the exact experimental values. We will consider the BM option and the various possibilities given in Eq. (6.1) and will look for a finite subgroup of an infinite Coxeter group that can provide those solutions. This search is made by using GAP [36]. Let us explain the procedure employed.

We start with four generators. For the sake of definiteness, let us call these four generators T_e, T_μ, S'_1, S'_2. We feed a presentation involving these generators of the following form and obtain the group:

$$\begin{aligned} \Big\langle T_e, T_\mu, S'_1, S'_2 \;\Big|\; & T_e^2, T_\mu^2, S_1'^2, S_2'^2, (T_e T_\mu)^2, (S'_1 S'_2)^2, \\ & (T_e S'_1)^{P_{e1}}, (T_e S'_2)^{P_{e2}}, (T_e S'_3)^{P_{e3}}, \\ & (T_\mu S'_1)^{P_{\mu 1}}, (T_\mu S'_2)^{P_{\mu 2}}, (T_\mu S'_3)^{P_{\mu 3}}, \\ & (T_\tau S'_1)^{P_{\tau 1}}, (T_\tau S'_2)^{P_{\tau 2}}, (T_\tau S'_3)^{P_{\tau 3}} \Big\rangle , \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

where $T_\tau = T_e T_\mu$ and $S'_3 = S'_1 S'_2$, inspired by Eqs. (3.7) and (4.9), which have just been used here as shorthand notations.

The first four conditions of Eq. (6.2) indicate that all generators are involutions. The next two conditions state that T_e commutes with T_μ whereas S'_1 commutes with S'_2. These six conditions of the presentation should be the same for all searches.

Each of the other conditions announces the order of one group element. If we had had only the orders of the elements $T_e S'_1$, $T_e S'_2$, $T_\mu S'_1$ and $T_\mu S'_2$, and if these orders had corresponded to the orders obtainable from the Coxeter diagrams of Fig. 1 with four generators, the resulting group would have been a finite Coxeter group. However, we exclude that possibility by making some exceptions, as we explain now.

Suppose, for the sake of definiteness, that we are trying to see how the BM matrix can be obtained. The absolute squared value of the first two elements of the

first row should be both equal to $\frac{1}{2}$. From Eq. (4.8), we see that this is possible if we have $k/p = \frac{1}{4}$. Previously, we used Eq. (4.7) to conclude that therefore these elements should have order $p = 4$. But now we allow for multiples of 4. As long as we keep the same value of k/p, we can obtain the same value of $|U_{\ell\alpha}|^2$. For this reason, we write the order of the element with a uppercase P in Eq. (6.2), indicating that k and p need not be relatively prime. In our search, we allow for a GCD up to 3 for each pair of k and p.

Even after making that adjustment, if we restrict the presentation table of Eq. (6.2) only to the first six declarations and the orders of $T_eS'_1$, $T_eS'_2$, $T_\mu S'_1$ and $T_\mu S'_2$ only, we would obtain a Coxeter group because of the definition given in Eq. (5.1). The group would be infinite, because it would not correspond to any of the diagrams of Fig. 1. But we have more conditions. We take these other conditions in such a way that they provide us with an acceptable value of $|U_{\ell\alpha}|^2$ that can satisfy Eq. (4.12).

Let us explain the strategy in some more detail. Suppose we want to see whether one can obtain the BM matrix. As seen from Eq. (4.4a), one row will comprise two entries with mod-squared values equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ and the other entry should be equal to zero. As seen from Eq. (4.8), the value $\frac{1}{2}$ can arise if $k/p = \frac{1}{4}$, and therefore if p is 4 or its multiple. The entry zero can arise if the value of p is 2 or any multiple of it. Similarly, for the other two rows, we need two elements to have orders which are multiples of 3, and the other element should have an order that is a multiple of 4. To summarize, the values of the powers $P_{\ell\alpha}$ appearing in Eq. (6.2) are tabulated below:

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc} P_{e1} & P_{e2} & P_{e3} \\ P_{\mu 1} & P_{\mu 2} & P_{\mu 3} \\ P_{\tau 1} & P_{\tau 2} & P_{\tau 3} \end{array}\right]_{\rm BM} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc} 4a_1 & 4a_2 & 2a_3 \\ 3b_1 & 3b_2 & 4b_3 \\ 3c_1 & 3c_2 & 4c_3 \end{array}\right], \tag{6.3}$$

where $a_1, a_2, \cdots, c_3$ are integers. Similarly, we need the following values for the other solutions:

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc} P_{e1} & P_{e2} & P_{e3} \\ P_{\mu 1} & P_{\mu 2} & P_{\mu 3} \\ P_{\tau 1} & P_{\tau 2} & P_{\tau 3} \end{array}\right]_{\text{Eq. (6.1}a\text{)}} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc} 4a_1 & 3a_2 & 3a_3 \\ 3b_1 & 4b_2 & 3b_3 \\ 3c_1 & 3c_2 & 4c_3 \end{array}\right], \tag{6.4a}$$

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc} P_{e1} & P_{e2} & P_{e3} \\ P_{\mu 1} & P_{\mu 2} & P_{\mu 3} \\ P_{\tau 1} & P_{\tau 2} & P_{\tau 3} \end{array}\right]_{\text{Eq. (6.1}b\text{)}} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc} 5a_1 & 3a_2 & 5a_3 \\ 5b_1 & 5b_2 & 3b_3 \\ 3c_1 & 5c_2 & 5c_3 \end{array}\right], \tag{6.4b}$$

Table 4: Result of the search described in the text. For each kind of PMNS matrix elements, we give the possible finite subgroup of a Coxeter group. The numbers given under the columns marked "cardinality" and "serial Id", taken together, form what has been called the `SmallGroup` Id in the GAP internet archives.

Type of PMNS matrix	Finite subgroup		3-d irrep?
	Cardinality	Serial Id	
BM	96	227	Yes
	192	1538	Yes
	768	1088660	Yes
	768	1090071	Yes
	768	1090139	Yes
Eq. (6.1a)	12	4	No
	108	17	No
	576	8654	No
Eq. (6.1b)	(no solution)		
Eq. (6.1c)	1080	260	Yes

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc} P_{e1} & P_{e2} & P_{e3} \\ P_{\mu 1} & P_{\mu 2} & P_{\mu 3} \\ P_{\tau 1} & P_{\tau 2} & P_{\tau 3} \end{array}\right]_{\text{Eq. (6.1c)}} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc} 5a_1 & 3a_2 & 5a_3 \\ 5b_1 & 3b_2 & 5b_3 \\ 3c_1 & 4c_2 & 3c_3 \end{array}\right], \tag{6.4c}$$

For each case, it has to be remembered that we allow for reshuffling of rows and columns. For a search in each category, we take the value of each of the integers to run from 1 to 3.

Because there are extra conditions now, we do not obtain the Coxeter group. Rather, we obtain a subgroup of the Coxeter group. Using GAP [36], we search whether the subgroup obtained with any given choice of the integers a_1 to c_3 is finite. We limit our search to subgroups with number of elements between 9 and 1200. Smaller groups are not considered because they do not have any 3-dimensional irrep, and larger groups are probably less interesting. Whenever we find a finite subgroup with cardinality in this range, we announce it in Table 4. And finally, also from GAP, we find whether the subgroup has any 3-dimensional irreducible representation. The result is also shown in Table 4.

We see that, for subgroups with cardinality up to 1200, we obtain no solution of the form advocated in Eq. (6.1b). For the form given in Eq. (6.1a), we find some

subgroups, but none of them has any 3-dimensional irrep. In fact, in desperation we continued the search somewhat further for this case and found that the next available finite subgroup has 1728 elements, but this one also does not have any 3-dimensional irrep. We did not continue further.

Among the other cases where there exist finite subgroups with 3-dimensional irreps, the BM solution has one vanishing element for the PMNS matrix whereas the solution of the type given in Eq. (6.1c) has none. For this reason, the BM solution might seem less preferable than the other. However, if we compare the absolute values, element by element, from Eqs. (4.3) and (4.4a), we find that for six elements of the PMNS matrix, the BM solution is consistent with experimental values in the 3σ limits. The solution of Eq. (6.1c) is definitely consistent with the values of five elements, though among the remaining ones, it misses one very narrowly. Thus, there is not much to choose from between these two. However, it should be realized that none of these two can provide a solution that is consistent with the experimental data. They can only be of interest if the PMNS values they generate can be taken as some first approximation, to be corrected by other effects coming from some other physics.

7 Summary

We have considered all finite Coxeter groups whose number of generators range from 2 to 4 which appear in Fig. 1. It would have been great if we could find a group with 4 generators to satisfy all known experimental constraints, because then we could have predicted the magnitudes of all elements of the PMNS matrix. Unfortunately, our analysis shows that such groups are not compatible with experimental results. There are acceptable solutions with Coxeter groups with 3 generators, although these are only partial solutions. With a 3 generator group, we can calculate the magnitudes of elements in one row or in one column of the PMNS matrix. Different solutions have been shown in § 5.4. For a group with 2 generators, only one element can be calculated. However, no such group is acceptable, for reasons described in § 5.3.

We then searched among the infinite Coxeter groups with 4 generators. We identify the very few types of PMNS matrices that can be generated from a Coxeter group, and tried to see whether any finite subgroup of a Coxeter group can provide that pattern. Within the limits in which we have performed the search, we have obtained a few such subgroups, which we have listed in Table 4. Some of these

groups do not have any 3-dimensional irreducible representation and are therefore unacceptable. Some can produce the BM matrix which has one element equal to zero. There is only one solution that is consistent with non-zero entries for each element, and has 3-dimensional irrep as well.

Acknowledgements: We thank Uday Shakar Chakraborty for pointing out at some references on Coxeter groups, to Max Horn for suggestions regarding the use of the computer program GAP, and to Renato Fonseca for pointing out some important works in the field which we had missed in the first version of this paper submitted to the archives (`xxx.lanl.gov`).

References

[1] Double Chooz collaboration, F. Ardellier et al., *Double Chooz: A Search for the neutrino mixing angle theta(13)*, `hep-ex/0606025`.

[2] RENO collaboration, J. K. Ahn et al., *Observation of Reactor Electron Antineutrino Disappearance in the RENO Experiment*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** (2012) 191802, [`1204.0626`].

[3] Daya Bay collaboration, F. P. An et al., *Spectral measurement of electron antineutrino oscillation amplitude and frequency at Daya Bay*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112** (2014) 061801, [`1310.6732`].

[4] The KamLAND Collaboration collaboration, S. Abe et al., *Precision measurement of neutrino oscillation parameters with kamland*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** (Jun, 2008) 221803.

[5] IceCube collaboration, M. G. Aartsen et al., *Measurement of Atmospheric Neutrino Oscillations with IceCube*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111** (2013) 081801, [`1305.3909`].

[6] F. Capozzi, G. L. Fogli, E. Lisi, A. Marrone, D. Montanino and A. Palazzo, *Status of three-neutrino oscillation parameters, circa 2013*, *Phys. Rev.* **D89** (2014) 093018, [`1312.2878`].

[7] Particle Data Group collaboration, K. A. Olive et al., *Review of Particle Physics*, *Chin. Phys.* **C38** (2014) 090001.

[8] S. F. King and C. Luhn, *Neutrino Mass and Mixing with Discrete Symmetry*, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **76** (2013) 056201, [`1301.1340`].

[9] W. Grimus and P. O. Ludl, *Finite flavour groups of fermions*, *J. Phys.* **A45** (2012) 233001, [1110.6376].

[10] G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, *Discrete Flavor Symmetries and Models of Neutrino Mixing*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82** (2010) 2701–2729, [1002.0211].

[11] F. Vissani, *A Study of the scenario with nearly degenerate Majorana neutrinos*, hep-ph/9708483.

[12] V. D. Barger, S. Pakvasa, T. J. Weiler and K. Whisnant, *Bimaximal mixing of three neutrinos*, *Phys. Lett.* **B437** (1998) 107–116, [hep-ph/9806387].

[13] P. F. Harrison, D. H. Perkins and W. G. Scott, *Tri-bimaximal mixing and the neutrino oscillation data*, *Phys. Lett.* **B530** (2002) 167, [hep-ph/0202074].

[14] P. F. Harrison and W. G. Scott, *Symmetries and generalizations of tri-bimaximal neutrino mixing*, *Phys. Lett.* **B535** (2002) 163–169, [hep-ph/0203209].

[15] C. S. Lam, *Symmetry of Lepton Mixing*, *Phys. Lett.* **B656** (2007) 193–198, [0708.3665].

[16] C. S. Lam, *The Unique Horizontal Symmetry of Leptons*, *Phys. Rev.* **D78** (2008) 073015, [0809.1185].

[17] C. S. Lam, *A Bottom-up analysis of horizontal symmetry*, 0907.2206.

[18] D. Hernandez and A. Yu. Smirnov, *Lepton mixing and discrete symmetries*, *Phys. Rev.* **D86** (2012) 053014, [1204.0445].

[19] D. Hernandez and A. Yu. Smirnov, *Discrete symmetries and model-independent patterns of lepton mixing*, *Phys. Rev.* **D87** (2013) 053005, [1212.2149].

[20] R. de Adelhart Toorop, F. Feruglio and C. Hagedorn, *Finite Modular Groups and Lepton Mixing*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B858** (2012) 437–467, [1112.1340].

[21] M. Holthausen, K. S. Lim and M. Lindner, *Lepton Mixing Patterns from a Scan of Finite Discrete Groups*, *Phys. Lett.* **B721** (2013) 61–67, [1212.2411].

[22] C. Hagedorn, A. Meroni and L. Vitale, *Mixing patterns from the groups $\Sigma(n\phi)$*, *J. Phys.* **A47** (2014) 055201, [1307.5308].

[23] L. Lavoura and P. O. Ludl, *Residual $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetries and lepton mixing*, *Phys. Lett.* **B731** (2014) 331–336, [1401.5036].

[24] R. M. Fonseca and W. Grimus, *Classification of lepton mixing matrices from finite residual symmetries*, *JHEP* **09** (2014) 033, [1405.3678].

[25] B. Hu, *Lepton Mixing, Residual Symmetries, and Trigonometric Diophantine Equations*, *Phys. Rev.* **D90** (2014) 073012, [1407.4722].

[26] S.-F. Ge, *Unifying Residual $\mathbb{Z}_2^{23} \otimes \mathbb{Z}_2^{12}$ Symmetries and Quark-Lepton Complementarity*, 1406.1985.

[27] G.-J. Ding, S. F. King and T. Neder, *Generalised CP and $\Delta(6n^2)$ family symmetry in semi-direct models of leptons*, *JHEP* **12** (2014) 007, [1409.8005].

[28] J. Turner, *Predictions for leptonic mixing angle correlations and nontrivial Dirac CP violation from A_5 with generalized CP symmetry*, *Phys. Rev.* **D92** (2015) 116007, [1507.06224].

[29] C. S. Lam, *Built-in horizontal symmetry of SO(10)*, *Phys. Rev.* **D89** (2014) 095017, [1403.7835].

[30] L.-L. Chau and W.-Y. Keung, *Comments on the Parametrization of the Kobayashi-Maskawa Matrix*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53** (1984) 1802.

[31] M. W. Davis, *The geometry and topology of coxeter groups*. Princeton University Press, 2008.

[32] T. Brown, S. Pakvasa, H. Sugawara and Y. Yamanaka, *Neutrino Masses, Mixing and Oscillations in S(4) Model of Permutation Symmetry*, *Phys. Rev.* **D30** (1984) 255.

[33] R. N. Mohapatra, M. K. Parida and G. Rajasekaran, *High scale mixing unification and large neutrino mixing angles*, *Phys. Rev.* **D69** (2004) 053007, [hep-ph/0301234].

[34] C. Hagedorn, M. Lindner and R. N. Mohapatra, *S(4) flavor symmetry and fermion masses: Towards a grand unified theory of flavor*, *JHEP* **06** (2006) 042, [hep-ph/0602244].

[35] W. Grimus and L. Lavoura, *A Three-parameter model for the neutrino mass matrix*, *J. Phys.* **G34** (2007) 1757–1770, [hep-ph/0611149].

[36] The GAP Group, *GAP — Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, Version 4.7.9*, 2015. (http://www.gap-system.org).